



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

new basis proposed by the Hague Convention. Though the Convention has not yet gone into effect, the offer was made in harmony with the principle enunciated in its third article. While the offer of mediation, therefore, is a tacit recognition that the two republics are entitled to be considered as having a certain international standing, yet it cannot justly be considered by England as in any sense an unfriendly act. Though it has awakened some criticism on the part of the British war-public, it has generally been accepted in the friendly spirit in which it was made.

In this sense, our government's action is of the very highest importance. Mediation on this new plane will probably, through the force of this one act, remain as a permanent feature of international law, whether the Hague Convention is ratified or not. The change of tone which will thereby be brought about in international relations, in the course of years, must necessarily prove a powerful factor in allaying irritation and suppressing the spirit of belligerency. The effect even in the final settlement of the South African questions may be much more marked than present indications would lead us to expect.

It is possible that this offer of mediation may be the means of saving the Hague Convention and securing its final adoption. There has been some fear that, though our Senate has already ratified it, the uncertainty of present international conditions may finally cause it to lapse. Under these circumstances, our government's action in proposing mediation in accordance with the provisions of the convention, must give strong support to it as a whole, and may prove the determining factor in inducing the governments represented at The Hague to set the seal of their approval on the great work accomplished by their representatives in the Peace Conference.

Treat the Philippines as We Treat Cuba.

In his speech in the Senate on the 7th of March, Senator Lodge used the following words: "Another proposition is that we should treat the Philippines as we treat Cuba. That is precisely what we are doing. But what is really meant by this demand is not that we treat the Philippines as we treat Cuba, but that we should make to them a promise as to the future."

It is incomprehensible that a man of Mr. Lodge's intelligence should have uttered these sentences on the floor of the Senate, and then allowed them to stand unchanged, as he has, in the revised form of his speech. His memory must have been badly dozing at both times.

There is scarcely a shadow of resemblance between the ways in which we have treated Cuba and the Philippines. Before the war with Spain we made a solemn pledge to Cuba by joint resolution of Congress against forcible annexation. We have made

no such pledge to the Philippines either before or during or since the war. In the treaty of peace we required Spain to *renounce sovereignty over Cuba*, and we went no further. In the case of the Philippines, in the same treaty we required her to *cede* them to the United States. Because of this action, suspected by them early in the negotiations, the Filipinos were angered into attempting to maintain by arms against us the liberty which they desired and believed themselves entitled to. The treatment of the Cubans rendered them peaceful, thankful and confiding. The Filipinos have been fighting us ever since. We have gradually withdrawn our troops from Cuba; we are still maintaining an army of sixty thousand men in the Philippines, and are daily killing numbers of the inhabitants.

Since the war with Spain, we have made and reiterated time and again to Cuba "a promise as to the future." In the most solemn way, we have told her that we mean to keep our Congressional pledge to her, and that she shall ultimately have her independence if she wishes it. This has been done by the President in his message, by the governor-general in person, and, since Mr. Lodge made his seventh-of-March speech, by Secretary Root in the most formal and unequivocal way. We have made no such promise to the Filipinos. They have asked for it, but in every case we have refused them. We have, on the contrary, told them in the plainest terms that their territory is a part of our domain, and that we mean to hold it forever. The President has said this in messages and speeches; the Philippine Commission has said it; the Senate has said it in its formal ratification of the peace treaty; the press has said it; Senator Lodge, Senator Beveridge, and the whole anti-Filipino junta have said it.

It is true, we have not told the Cubans at what time in the future they shall have their independence, and in this respect only we have not made to them "a promise as to the future." But what resemblance is there between this and the refusal to give the Filipinos the faintest assurance that they shall ever have independence, or rather the open declaration to them and to the world that they shall never have it, but shall remain forever under the sovereignty of the United States? We fail to see any, and we doubt if Mr. Lodge, on second thought, would persist in his contention that there is any. The methods of treatment of the two peoples have been diametrically opposite in every essential point.

However, this passage in Senator Lodge's speech is valuable in one particular; it is a public confession that we ought to treat the Philippines as we have been treating Cuba. But that was not his purpose in uttering it. If the passage has any sense at all, and any appropriateness in the speech, it can only mean one thing. It was merely a covert way of saying that all of our resolutions, declarations and

promises to Cuba have been treacherous decoys, to delude the Cubans and disarm them of suspicion, and that in the end we mean to break every one of them, and force the island to accept our sovereignty whether it wishes to do so or not. Or, if there be an alternative, does Mr. Lodge mean to say that all our adverse treatment of the Philippines, all our stout assertions of intention to keep them forever, have been mere trifling and falsehood, and that it has been our good and honest intention all along to give them ultimately, not simply some vague "measure of self-government," but the liberty of determining finally for themselves what shall be their political destiny? No one can believe, after reading Mr. Lodge's utterances, that he had the remotest intention of putting himself on this horn of the dilemma.

Annual Meeting.

The Annual Business Meeting of the American Peace Society will be held in Boston on Monday, the 7th of May, at two o'clock P.M. The annual reports of the Board of Directors and of the Treasurer will be read, officers elected for the coming year, and any other business transacted which may be presented. All members, both annual and life, are entitled to participate in the business of the meeting, and all who can possibly do so are urged to be present. Time will be allowed for discussion after the reading of the Annual Report. Special notices will be sent in time to all members giving the place of the meeting, which will probably be Tremont Temple.

Editorial Notes.

Help the
Cause Now.

A number of friends have generously responded to the appeal for funds published in the February *ADVOCATE*. But as yet the amount received is not at all sufficient to cover the deficit of the year. The most rigid economy, consistent with the demands made upon us, has been practised in every way, and we have been compelled to leave much undone that ought to have been done. It will require more than a thousand dollars yet to enable us to close our financial year on the last day of this month out of debt. This is not a large sum, and we feel sure that friends of the great cause of international peace, which the American Peace Society has so long labored in season and out of season to promote, will be ready to supply even more than this amount. The state of the trust funds held for our use still continues as explained last year, and we are compelled temporarily to supplement the income from other sources. The importance of our work does not at this time need to be argued. The present senselessly warlike condition of the world is the most powerful plea that can be made. Every month, through our two papers and large quantities of literature

circulated, we are speaking to many thousands of people, and we wish we could utter the voice of peace and reason in every home in the land. There are many evidences not only that our work is highly appreciated, but that it has been unusually fruitful the past year in sustaining the faith and courage of the friends of peace and in creating new opposition to the folly and insanity of war. Mr. Hodgson Pratt writes from Europe to the editor: "There is no worker now living whose exposition of facts and principles connected with the question of arbitration and peace I so greatly value. I always read everything you write with the greatest satisfaction and profit. You seem to me to bring such a ripe judgment, such a knowledge of affairs and such a chastened enthusiasm to bear upon all the questions which come before us." The words of appreciation coming to us are not lightly valued, but they make us all the more anxious to do wider and more fruitful work hereafter. Will our friends not aid us in holding and extending the field? Some one has recently sent twenty-five dollars without giving any name but that of "A Friend of Peace." We are always encouraged to know the names of those who send contributions, but we cheerfully forgive in advance for not giving their names all who will send us as much as this donor did. "A Friend of Peace" is the name of a very large and growing family, and we shall be delighted to hear from every member of it, even from the newest-born. The names of both the treasurer and the secretary of the Society appear on the second page of this paper. Contributions sent to either one of them will be promptly acknowledged.

Dishonoring
John Bright.

The effort has been made in England, especially by the *Methodist Times*, to make it appear that if John Bright were living, he would be a hearty supporter of the British side of the South African war. Helen Bright Clark, Mr. Bright's daughter, wrote three times to the editor of the *Methodist Times* protesting against her father's name being dragged into support of the war. Each time her letter was refused insertion. She finally published the letter in the *Morning Leader*. In the course of it she said, speaking for Mr. Bright's living relatives: "Not one of us can have a moment's doubt as to what his attitude would have been. If he had been now living, and in his full vigor, he might perhaps have aroused his country in time to avert what would have appeared to him a measureless calamity. . . . I have reason to complain of the treatment which endeavors to separate him from the little company of faithful friends of peace and of fair and just dealing with other nations, to which in life he ever belonged." At the recent great peace meeting in Exeter Hall, Mrs. Fisher Unwin, daughter of Richard Cobden, was one of the speakers. In the course